1

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

DAVID D. HENWOOD, **PLAINTIFF** 

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:01CV996

VS.

MAY 18, 2004 UNISOURCE WORLDWIDE INC. & GEORGIA-PACIFIC CORP., **VOLUME II DEFENDANTS** 

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

#### CONTINUED DEPOSITION OF DAVID D. HENWOOD

#### APPEARANCES:

#### FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

WOFSEY, ROSEN, KWESKIN & KURIANSKY 600 Summer Street Stamford, Connecticut 06901 By: DANIEL M. YOUNG, ESQUIRE

#### FOR THE DEFENDANTS:

**HUNTON & WILLIAMS** 951 East Byrd Street Richmond, Virginia 23219 By: C. RANDOLPH SULLIVAN, ESQUIRE

1	Deposition of DAVID D. HENWOOD,
2	taken on behalf of the Defendants in the above-
3	entitled cause, wherein David D. Henwood is
4	Plaintiff and Unisource Worldwide Inc., Et Al, are
5	Defendants, pending in the United States District
6	Court, District of Connecticut, pursuant to notice,
7	before Walter J. Krzepek, a Notary Public in and for
8	the State of Connecticut, County of New Haven, held
9	on May 18, 2004, at 10:30 o'clock A.M., at Wofsey,
10	Rosen, Kweskin & Kuriansky, 600 Summer Street,
11	Stamford, Connecticut, at which time the parties
12	were represented as hereinbefore set forth and Mrs.
13	David D. Henwood was also present
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

1	DAVID D. HENWOOD
2	Having been called as a witness, having been
3	previously sworn, continued to testify upon his oath
4	as follows:
5	
6	MR. YOUNG: I'd just like to state I
7	think we're in complete agreement this is a limited
8	deposition and it's being taken pursuant to your
9	request and the court's order, that limited
10	discovery can occur solely on the issue of
11	promissory estoppel.
12	MR. SULLIVAN: We agree.
13	
14	CONTINUED DIRECT EXAMINATION
15	BY MR. SULLIVAN:
16	Q Mr. Henwood, good morning.
17	A Good morning.
18	Q I don't think this is going to take a lot
19	of time and I agree with what Dan said, this is your
20	continued deposition for purposes of asking
21	questions about the promissory estoppel claim that
22	has been added to your complaint.
23	So, obviously, we're going to focus
24	from the allegation that you made as to statements

1	made to you by Mr. Fitzgerald.
2	Do you know, is Mr. Fitzgerald still
3	alive; do you know?
4	A I don't know.
5	Q You're not aware of his passing away?
6	A No.
7	Q Do you recall when the last time was that
8	you spoke with him, whether it was when you were
9	both at PCUS or sometime thereafter?
10	A My best recollection is it was at his
11	retirement party.
12	Q Do you remember when that was, ballpark?
13	A I don't remember when it was.
14	Q Do you recall how long you and Mr.
15	Fitzgerald worked together with PCUS?
16	A It was at least five years. It might have
17	been seven. I'd have to go back and look.
18	Q Just for clarification purposes, I take it
19	you're not, at least based on your complaint, you're
20	not relying upon statements made by anybody else
21	other than Mr. Fitzgerald for purposes of your
22	promissory estoppel claim; is that right?
23	MR. YOUNG: Objection to the form,

POST REPORTING SERVICE HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

just to the extent you're asking the witness for a

- legal conclusion of what's going to support the
- 2 claim, he might not be fully aware of, but I'll
- 3 allow you to answer.
- 4 Q As we sit here today, at the deposition,
- 5 are you relying upon any other statements other than
- 6 statements made to you by Robert Fitzgerald for
- 7 purposes of the amended claim; the promissory
- 8 estoppel claim?
- 9 A You'll have to clarify that because there
- were, as I said, there was just that period of time
- that I worked directly for him but I was there
- longer, obviously.
- 13 Q I guess what I'm asking, you had made --
- and we're going to go through the amended complaint
- 15 -- you made allegations that Mr. Fitzgerald made
- statements to you about providing support and not
- interfering with the Watchtower, and we'll go
- through those as far as your amended complaint, but
- are there any other statements not focused on Mr.
- 20 Fitzgerald but any other statements by anybody else
- 21 that you're saying were promises made by Georgia-
- 22 Pacific that were not fulfilled?
- A I am relying on other promises that were
- 24 made.

1 We'll come back to those. I want to be 2 sure I understand exactly what the nature of your 3 complaint is as far as A.T. Clayton and we spent 4 time initially in your deposition talking about your 5 experience, your lawsuit against A.T. Clayton. 6 Did you work anywhere else in between 7 A.T. Clayton and PCUS? 8 A No. 9 My recollection is that you had an actual 10 written contract with A.T. Clayton? 11 A Yes. 12 Q The claim was they had breeched that 13 contract? 14 A Yes. 15 Do you recall what the contract provided 16 for, generally, in terms? Was it only compensation 17 terms or did it also include other things? 18 A It included a variety of promises. 19 Do you remember -- obviously we haven't 20 seen the contract but do you remember what other 21 promises it included? 22 MR. YOUNG: I just object to the 23 form. I'm not sure we've established it was a

POST REPORTING SERVICE HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

breech of contract; when you said have you seen it.

1		MR. SULLIVAN: I believe Mr. Henwood
2	said it	was a written contract.
3	Q	But was it a written contract?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	I know it's hard to remember. That was,
6	whater	ver, 20 years ago but do you recall what terms
7	the con	ntract generally provided?
8		I assume there were compensation
9	terms?	
10	A	It was, essentially, the same conditions
11	that e	xisted with the contract I had with PCUS.
12	Q	What were those conditions?
13	A	That I would earn a percentage of the
14	gross	margin, that I would receive the normal
15	benef	its that an employee has such as retirement
16	benef	its, pension benefits, health benefits, et
17	cetera	ı.
18		That I would continue to receive full
19	suppo	ort from the company for the accounts that were
20	mine,	or accounts that I brought to the company.
21		That the company would strive to
22	assist	me in every way possible to enhance and grow
23	the ac	counts that I brought with me or gained during
24	my en	mployment.

1	Essentially, that was it.
2	Q The nature of the lawsuit that you brought
3	against A.T. Clayton was that it had failed to pay
4	commissions that were owed to you under the
5	contract?
6	A Yes.
7	Q Were there any other allegations that you
8	were making as far as failure to support or
9	interference with accounts, that sort of thing?
10	A Not to the best of my recollection.
11	Q Do you recall whether the contract said
12	anything specifically, the contract between yourself
13	and A.T. Clayton, about the Watchtower?
14	A It did not, to my recollection.
15	Q Did your experience with A.T. Clayton, you
16	know, leading to the lawsuit make you, I guess,
17	suspicious, for lack of a better term, of employers
18	with respect to your working as a sales
19	representative?
20	A No.
21	Q It didn't? Okay.
22	When you left the employment with
23	A.T. Clayton you then started with P.C. West,
24	correct?

- 1 A Yes.
- 2 Q Did you know Mr. Fitzgerald prior to
- 3 communicating with him about employment
- 4 possibilities?
- 5 A No.
- 6 Q How did that come about? How did your
- 7 interaction with him come about, talking about
- 8 employment?
- 9 A I believe I testified to this before but
- it came as a result of a contact made by a
- 11 headhunter.
- 12 Q Who else were you talking with, other
- employers at that time, other than PCUS?
- 14 A It was through him.
- 15 Q Through the headhunter?
- 16 A Yes.
- 17 Q Do you recall who those were?
- 18 A Well, I know I testified to this before.
- 19 I'd have to go back and look at the deposition.
- 20 One that comes to mind was Gould
- 21 Paper Company and Clifford Paper Company.
- Q Do you know where Gould paper is
- 23 headquartered?
- A I believe its New York City.

- 1 Q And what about Clifford?
- 2 A I believe they are headquartered in New
- 3 Jersey.
- 4 Q Take me through -- I don't think we got
- 5 into this level of detail earlier in your deposition
- 6 but how many discussions, if you remember, did you
- 7 have with Mr. Fitzgerald before you began employment
- 8 with PCUS?
- 9 A I don't recall.
- 10 Q Was it just one?
- 11 A No, it was more than one.
- 12 Q To the best that you could remember,
- because you're basing your claim on statements that
- he made to you, tell me what discussions there were;
- 15 I mean what he said, what you said, to the best you
- 16 can recall, about your employment with PCUS?
- 17 A He indicated that he was knowledgeable
- about the owner of A.T. Clayton and that he was very
- much aware of the job that I had done for them.
- He was very anxious to acquire this
- 21 account.
- Q Referring to Watchtower?
- A Yes. And that if I could do that kind of
- 24 a job with Watchtower, then the likelihood would be

1	that I could do it with others.
2	That he was a president within a
3	public corporation and he would run a risk of losing
4	his own job if he were to try and somehow
5	shortchange a salesman on his commissions.
6	That they had people above him in the
7	management team that were lifetime members of the
8	paper industry, well known to the paper mills and to
9	many, many large and small customers.
10	That they had a strong team in terms
11	of being able to manage things like accounts
12	receivable and back-up personnel available for
13	inside sales purposes, which is important.
14	He was very clear to assure me that
15	he would never give me cause for concern in terms of
16	being straightforward in his dealings with me
17	regarding commission payments.
18	That he was willing to pay me a
19	salary for the time it took to reestablish the
20	account with PCUS.
21	That he personally could guarantee
22	that any management personnel from the parent
23	corporation, that were appropriate in a given
24	circumstance, he could make available to me.

1	In other words, he was endeavoring to
2	show me that he and the company that he was the
3	president of were certainly as capable and hopefully
4	more capable then anybody else I could talk to in
5	furthering my efforts to build a substantial
6	customer base and that he would support that in
7	every way possible.
8	Q To touch on a couple of things you just
9	said, when you said that he stated that because he
10	was president of a corporation he could risk losing
11	his job if he shortchanged a sales rep on
12	commissions, what was the context for that coming
13	up, if you remember?
14	A Only that A.T. Clayton is a private
15	company.
16	Q But the context of him making that sort of
17	statement, do you remember what you all were talking
18	about when that came up?
19	Let me rephrase that.
20	Was that in the context of you
21	telling him about the lawsuit?
22	A There was no lawsuit then.
23	Q The lawsuit you had prior with A.T.
24	Clayton?

1	A	No.
2	Q	Do you remember what the context was? I'm
3	just as	king because it seems like an odd thing for
4	him to	, me too, odd for him to just volunteer that.
5		MR. YOUNG: Randy, can I correct your
6	assum	ption you made in the last question?
7		I'm not sure when the lawsuit was.
8	You ju	st said it was prior to the time of this.
9		MR. SULLIVAN: Okay.
10	Q	When did you file the lawsuit against A.T.
11	Clayto	on?
12	A	Within a few months of joining PCUS.
13	Q	So you had already began work with PCUS
14	before	e that was actually initiated?
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	When you were talking with Mr. Fitzgerald
17	did yo	ou tell him about your concerns, I guess, about
18	the wa	ny A.T. Clayton had paid you?
19	A	Yes.
20	Q	Was this statement did this come up in
21	that co	ontext, do you recall?
22	A	What statement is that?
23	Q	The statement about him being president of

POST REPORTING SERVICE HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

a public corporation and risk losing his job if he

1	shortchanged you on commissions?
2	A Yes.
3	Q Why did you tell him about your
4	perceptions of being shortchanged, by putting words
5	in your mouth, being shortchanged by A.T. Clayton?
6	A Because we were down to the point of his
7	wanting to know why I would want to leave A.T.
8	Clayton; what were the things that were in my mind,
9	that I was actively pursuing other opportunities in
10	the industry.
11	Q At the time that you were talking to Mr.
12	Fitzgerald, about going to work for PCUS, I take it
13	you knew that because of your relationship with the
14	Watchtower that you could bring that account to PCUS
15	from A.T. Clayton?
16	A I haven't got a way to answer that
17	question.
18	Q You didn't know whether or not Watchtower
19	would follow you to PCUS?
20	Let me ask it this way.
21	At that point in time, when you were
22	talking with Mr. Fitzgerald about employment for
23	PCUS, what was your thought as to whether or not you
24	would be able to bring the Watchtower account with

- 1 you from A.T. Clayton?
- 2 A I felt certain I could do it.
- 3 Q Why was that?
- 4 A Because the supplier at that point was
- 5 failing in their ability to produce a suitable
- 6 product.
- 7 Q When you talk about supplier you're not
- 8 talking about A.T. Clayton, you're talking about the
- 9 paper mill?
- 10 A Yes, our supplier.
- 11 Q Just out of curiosity, who was that at
- 12 that point?
- 13 A Georgia-Pacific.
- 14 Q This statement that you're saying -- well,
- was there anything else that you remember about your
- discussions with Mr. Fitzgerald concerning your
- employment, any other statements that he made to you
- other than what you've already talked about?
- 19 A He volunteered that, for instance, if we
- 20 had occasion to -- and this didn't pertain exactly -
- 21 you're asking just in reference to Watchtower?
- Q Well, generally. I mean certainly
- 23 including Watchtower but generally statements that
- 24 he made to you about your employment?

1	Α	That	initially,	if there	was	a need	to	d٥
L	$\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$	mai,	minuany,	II uicic	was	a nocu	w	uυ

- 2 some expensive entertaining that the company would
- 3 pick that up, pick up the cost of that, but he
- 4 emphasized the intimacy of the involvement he had
- 5 with his sales people in terms of assisting them
- 6 with every asset possessed by the company at large;
- 7 in particular, to gain new business, build the
- 8 business that you already established and any --
- 9 whatever that might mean. It was unknown at that
- point, what the particular issue might be, but he
- 11 emphasized that.
- 12 Q Did you down the road, when Watchtower
- became a client of PCUS -- I mean earlier in your
- deposition you talked about with Dan Romanaux,
- 15 trying to keep him out of, sort of, the day to day
- dealings with Watchtower.
- Did you do the same thing with Mr.
- 18 Fitzgerald?
- 19 A No.
- Q What was his involvement with the
- 21 Watchtower account, as you got that going with PCUS?
- A We talked about it frequently, whatever
- 23 the issue was at the time.
- He assisted me in working with

1	potential suppliers.
2	Ask the question again? I'm missing-
3	-
4	Q I was trying to get a sense, based on your
5	statement about Dan Romanaux that you tried to keep
6	him out of the day to day works, was trying to get a
7	sense of Mr. Fitzgerald's involvement with you in
8	working with the Watchtower account during the time
9	that he was president, whether he was actively
10	involved or
11	A He was actively involved.
12	Q You said you had conversations with him
13	regularly about the account and about the supplier
14	situation?
15	A That's correct.
16	Q Let me go back to one of the things you
17	said as far as comments he made to you before your
18	employment.
19	When he stated that he would support
20	you and the company would support you, did he
21	elaborate on what that meant specifically or was
22	that in the context of all those other things that
23	you said?
24	I guess what I'm asking is the word

1	support. Did he specifically talk about what that
2	meant?
3	A Well, I think I've already testified to
4	that.
5	He was very clear and unequivocal in
6	his promises to me, that we wouldn't be dealing with
7	a sort of negative situation.
8	We would be dealing with a very
9	positive situation. That it would be he would be
10	actively assisting me in every way he possibly
11	could, to generate the business.
12	Q Earlier in your deposition you had
13	indicated that at no point during your employment
14	with PCUS was there a contract between Watchtower
15	and either you specifically or PCUS?
16	A That's right.
17	MR. YOUNG: Objection to the form. I
18	think the testimony was that the purchase orders
19	were contracts.
20	Q But there was no contract, requiring
21	Watchtower to continue purchasing paper through
22	PCUS?
23	A There was no written contract beyond the

POST REPORTING SERVICE HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

purchase orders.

1	Q Was there some sort of verbal contract
2	requiring Watchtower to purchase paper through PCUS?
3	A There was an understanding that we would
4	make every effort no, it's more than that.
5	It was that first of all the
6	orders they place, were not for just the immediate
7	future. They were generally a year at a time and so
8	that would always be honored, unless there were some
9	unforeseen circumstances that prevented the thing
10	from happening.
11	Q I guess my question is, Watchtower if they
12	wanted to could take their business elsewhere?
13	A At some point, yes.
14	Q What do you mean by at some point?
15	A We had agreed that we would endeavor to
16	work together to the maximum degree possible and if
17	it were not going to work out, it would be a
18	collective judgment that one was not going to
19	operate and leave the other hanging in space because
20	of the large commitment that evolved.
21	Q Who was that agreement with?
22	A Max Larson, Ralph Lindem; together.
23	Q That was just a verbal understanding

POST REPORTING SERVICE HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

between the three of you?

1	A	It was the result of a variety of
2	discus	sions, yes.
3	Q	But again that didn't prevent them from
4	taking	their business elsewhere, correct?
5	A	No. Well, I'm not it would prevent
6	them i	n the sense of the level of the strength of
7	the con	mmitment they would have made verbally.
8	Q	I'm not sure I'm following you. What do
9	you m	ean?
10	A	Well, that they wouldn't act
11	precip	pitously, my feeling was, and I think it
12	appea	rs to me we were acting in good faith.
13	Q	But nothing required them to purchase
14	paper	from PCUS for a two-year period, as an
15	exam	ple?
16	A	No.
17	Q	I don't think I ever asked you this. Did
18	you fe	eel like when Watchtower ultimately took its
19	busine	ess from Fraser, they had violated some sort of
20	agreei	ment with you?
21		MR. YOUNG: I'll object because I
22	think	this line of questioning is not part of the
23	promi	ssory estoppel claim.
24		MR. SULLIVAN: I think it is. You're

POST REPORTING SERVICE HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1	talking about his reliance and his expectations
2	coming in to working with PCUS.
3	MR. YOUNG: Okay. You could answer.
4	THE WITNESS: Can I clear up
5	something before I answer that question?
6	MR. YOUNG: You need to answer Mr.
7	Sullivan's question, then we can take a break if you
8	want.
9	A Would you ask it again?
10	Q Sure. I'm just my recollection the
11	reason I'm even asking these questions is my
12	recollection from your earlier deposition testimony
13	was that it was clear that there was no contract
14	binding the Watchtower to continue purchasing from
15	PCUS.
16	And it sounds like what we're talking
17	about now is a little bit different then that.
18	I'm trying to figure out, did you
19	believe when the Watchtower ultimately went direct
20	with Fraser that Watchtower had in some way violated
21	some agreement with either you personally or with
22	PCUS?
23	A I can't answer the question in the form
24	it's stated.

1	Q How can you answer? I mean what's
2	difficult about that question?
3	A The difficulty is in that there were
4	several parties involved and the form is not it's
5	not in a form that I can answer.
6	Q It's not a complicated question, Mr.
7	Henwood.
8	You testified and Mr. Rittenbach has
9	testified that Watchtower for a long period of time
10	thought about going direct with Fraser Papers.
11	MR. YOUNG: Objection to form. I
12	don't think he testified to that.
13	MR. SULLIVAN: Mr. Henwood did not?
14	Q Well, I'm not trying to put words in your
15	mouth but there's evidence, at least from Mr.
16	Rittenbach, there was a thought process of going
17	direct for Fraser Papers for a number of years.
18	All I'm asking is, if you know, when
19	Watchtower did that. Forget about the other
20	parties.
21	Aside from Watchtower and PCUS, did
22	you believe that Watchtower was doing something that
23	violated some sort of an agreement with PCUS?
24	A No.

1	MR. SULLIVAN: Okay, you guys want to
2	take a break?
3	MR. YOUNG: Yes.
4	(Recess)
5	MR. YOUNG: I think Mr. Henwood's
6	confusion about the question was, just as we've been
7	over in prior depositions, Mr. Henwood's feelings
8	that there were other parties that weren't doing
9	what they had promised to do, like not just
10	Unisource but Fraser, that made a commitment to sell
11	to not sell directly with respect to the paper.
12	And his confusion with your question
13	was just to the extent he thought you were trying to
14	isolate the question and say that Watchtower was
15	privileged to do this and that Fraser was privileged
16	to do it also.
17	As you understand, as Mr. Henwood
18	previously testified, our position is that Fraser
19	had made a commitment to the paper community that it
20	wouldn't sell the type of paper exclusively.
21	MR. SULLIVAN: I'll just object to
22	the extent that I don't that his testimony
23	doesn't actually reflect that but I'm not saying it
24	does or doesn't. I'm just saying I don't recall.

1	I was just asking about Watchtower,
2	if they at any point in time forget about the
3	circumstances that you're alleging here.
4	BY MR. SULLIVAN:
5	Q I think you already answered the question
6	now but if the Watchtower at any point in time
7	elected to buy from somebody else, they weren't
8	violating any agreement with PCUS if they did that,
9	were they?
10	A No.
11	I would like to interrupt for a
12	second and just go back to the earlier part of the
13	testimony on the discussions with Fitzgerald.
14	Several points, one of which was the
15	commission rate, 45 percent, that was clearly a
16	promise that he had made verbally and in writing.
17	We had a lot of discussions regarding
18	the nature of the Watchtower, the Jehovah's
19	Witnesses and how they operated.
20	The length of time that I had done
21	business with them made me privy to the intricacies
22	of their way of doing business.
23	A good for instance was the fact that
24	they had no formal hierarchy. Everybody was really

1	the same. As a practical matter, wasn't the case
2	but for the record that's how they wanted it and
3	there were issues that you could bring up with
4	Newsweek that you would never discuss with the
5	Watchtower.
6	One of those would be you'd never ask
7	them who their suppliers were. It was something
8	that they would just not discuss and that you needed
9	to have a good knowledge of the demands they made in
10	terms of the service they expected from a supplier,
11	from whoever it might be, in order to successfully
12	continue to do business with them.
13	And so we pursued that at great
14	length because there were so many thoughts to it and
15	he assured me over and over again that he understood
16	what I was driving at.
17	It was a unique and unusual situation
18	and that being able to do that would make me a
19	valued employee, if I'm able to continue to do the
20	working for PCUS.
21	Q If you were able to bring the Watchtower

POST REPORTING SERVICE HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

Q Let me go back to one thing you said

account in and continue to service it?

A Right.

22

23

- 1 earlier, that you were certain that the Watchtower
- 2 would come over as an account to PCUS but you didn't
- 3 know that for a fact.
- 4 I take it there was no commitment by
- 5 the Watchtower to come over with you to PCUS?
- 6 A No.
- 7 Q You couldn't rely, based on what we've
- 8 just been talking about, you couldn't rely on
- 9 servicing the Watchtower account for any particular
- length of time because the Watchtower could take
- 11 their business elsewhere, correct?
- MR. YOUNG: Objection. You can
- 13 answer.
- 14 A Would you ask it again, please?
- 15 Q Sure. You couldn't rely on servicing the
- Watchtower account for any specific period of time
- because the Watchtower could take their business
- 18 elsewhere, correct?
- 19 A I could rely on -- no.
- Q Mr. Fitzgerald never said to you that you
- 21 would always service the Watchtower account for
- 22 PCUS, right?
- A Oh, he absolutely did as long as it was an
- 24 account of PCUS.

- 1 Q He specifically said those words?
- 2 A I believe so, to the best of my
- 3 recollection.
- 4 Q When did he say that?
- 5 A It was early in the discussions I had with
- 6 him, regarding going to work for him.
- 7 Q What exactly did he say?
- 8 A Well, that's the best of my recollection.
- 9 I don't recall exact words but that was the sum and
- 10 substance of it.
- 11 Q Tell me what the sum and substance was
- because I don't want to -- I want to be sure I'm
- understanding what you're saying.
- 14 A You can be sure that no one would
- interfere in any way with your handling and
- maintaining this account as your account, as long as
- 17 you're with the company; unless, of course, you had
- some outside reason -- not outside reason but unless
- 19 you had done something overt that would have
- 20 fractured the relationship.
- 21 Q And he specifically said those words to
- you or the best you can remember?
- A Well, he was saying it not only in terms
- 24 with Watchtower but any account.

1		The context was the salesman brings
2	in an a	ccount, it's his account and no one would
3	interfe	re with it. We would do everything we could
4	to try a	nd help it grow and help you make it grow.
5	Q	And that's true, I mean to the extent you
6	know,	that's true for any sales rep who brings an
7	accoun	t in or has an account, correct?
8	A	Well, I don't know about other people. I
9	know v	what our conversation was.
10	Q	You don't know what Mr. Fitzgerald told
11	other	sales reps that he was bringing into PCUS?
12	A	No.
13	Q	But I take it he never said to you that
14	you w	ould continue servicing the Watchtower account,
15	even i	f Watchtower came and said we're not going to
16	work	with Mr. Henwood?
17	A	We never had a discussion about that.
18	Q	So he never made that statement?
19	A	No.
20	Q	You said he made the statement before you
21	began	employment or after the statement you were
22	just ta	lking about?
23	A	I believe it was before.
24	Q	I take it, based on the way you already

1	answered the question, Mr. Fitzgerald never said to
2	you that you would keep the account if you did
3	something that lost or that caused Watchtower to
4	lose trust in you or faith in you?
5	A It was not a subject we discussed because
6	that's such a common sense issue, I guess. I had no
7	occasion to even think about it, nor discuss it.
8	Q Is there anything else? I'm just trying
9	to be sure we're covering all the bases.
10	Anything else that Mr. Fitzgerald
11	said to you in your discussions about employment
12	with PCUS that you're relying upon in this lawsuit,
13	as part of your promissory estoppel claim?
14	MR. YOUNG: Just to clarify, other
15	than what he's previously testified?
16	MR. SULLIVAN: Other than what he
17	testified to.
18	MR. YOUNG: At other depositions.
19	A I may be missing something that's
20	important but it's not coming to mind at the moment
21	Q Mr. Henwood, let me put in front of you
22	we don't need to mark it because it's already an
23	exhibit.
24	This was marked Plaintiff's Exhibit

- 1 No. 1 for purposes of your deposition back on
- 2 September 25, 2002.
- 3 And this, as I recall, this is the
- 4 written document that you are relying upon for
- 5 purposes of saying that you had a written contract
- 6 with PCUS, the written portion of it?
- 7 A Yes.
- 8 Q Obviously, the document speaks for itself
- 9 but is it fair to say that there's nothing in this
- letter from Mr. Fitzgerald to you that states that
- either he or PCUS will provide support to you,
- 12 nothing expressly says that, and you can take your
- time and read it.
- MR. YOUNG: Just object. The
- document speaks for itself. I'm not sure what your
- 16 question is.
- 17 A Well, I think even the last sentence, if
- 18 you feel confident, that would imply all the things
- 19 I already stated.
- Q Obviously we're not -- all I'm asking is,
- 21 there's nothing -- the word support is not written
- in this contract?
- 23 A No.
- Q There's nothing in this document that says

- 1 that you will always have the Watchtower account,
- 2 specifically?
- 3 A No.
- 4 Q Did you ask for -- let's take that point
- 5 as an example, your servicing of the Watchtower
- 6 account.
- 7 Did you ask for something to be in
- 8 writing saying that you would be the exclusive sales
- 9 rep for the Watchtower account?
- 10 A No.
- 11 Q How come?
- 12 A It was clearly understood that that was
- the ground rules.
- 14 Q Weren't you -- I mean just being in the
- midst of the A.T. Clayton situation and not knowing
- 16 Mr. Fitzgerald before, weren't you uncomfortable
- just taking his statements, you know, without having
- 18 something in writing?
- 19 A I wasn't uncomfortable at all.
- Q You talked about the other employers Gould
- and Clifford that you were seeking employment from
- at that point.
- Why did you think that PCUS was a
- better fit for you, I guess for lack of a better

- 1 term, then either Gould or Clifford?
- 2 A Well, Paper Corp had been in business a
- 3 very long time and had a very fine reputation and
- 4 had access to most of the paper mills in the
- 5 country, which I needed as an opportunity to --
- 6 well, that was the principle -- those were the
- 7 principle things.
- 8 Q Was PCUS offering you -- the letter refers
- 9 to the commission you'd be paid.
- Was PCUS offering you a higher
- 11 commission then Gould or Clifford?
- 12 A No.
- 13 Q Were they the same commission rates?
- 14 A Approximately.
- 15 Q Do you recall what Gould was offering you
- 16 by way of commission rate?
- 17 A To the best of my recollections they were
- all essentially the same, when you netted them out.
- 19 Q To the best of your recollection, when
- were you talking with individuals from Gould and
- 21 Clifford in comparison to when you were talking with
- 22 Mr. Fitzgerald about employment?
- A The conversations were not directly with
- them, they were through the headhunter.

- 1 Q I take it you didn't have any direct
- 2 communication with Gould?
- 3 A No.
- 4 Q And no direct communication with Clifford?
- 5 A Right. Yes.
- 6 Q Did you have a job offer from Gould?
- 7 A No.
- 8 Q Did you have a job offer from Clifford?
- 9 A No.
- 10 Q I'm just asking at the time you accepted
- 11 the PCUS employment.
- MR. YOUNG: Was that the end of the
- last question?
- MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. He already said
- 15 no. I was just clarifying at the time.
- 16 Q Is your answer still the same? The time
- 17 I'm asking about is when you accepted employment
- with PCUS.
- 19 A Yes.
- Q If Mr. Fitzgerald had not made all the
- 21 statements that you talked about Mr. Fitzgerald
- 22 making to you, if he had not made those statements,
- would you have accepted employment with PCUS?
- A I have no way to answer that.

1	Q In terms of and you've already I
2	mean you've already talked about your relationship
3	with Watchtower.
4	Fair to say that at the time you
5	started with PCUS you certainly believed that you
6	knew the Watchtower account, more about their
7	service needs than any other sales rep as far as the
8	paper that you were selling them?
9	A I believed that I knew the Watchtower
10	account and their requirements.
11	Q Why were you concerned well, were you
12	concerned about another sales rep, internally, PCUS
13	or Unisource being able to take your place with the
14	Watchtower?
15	A No.
16	MR. YOUNG: I'm sorry, the no was
17	because you said why, then you said
18	MR. SULLIVAN: Changed it to were you
19	concerned about it.
20	MR. YOUNG: Okay.
21	Q I take it, based on what you've already
22	testified to, at any point in time during your
23	employment with PCUS or later Websource for that
24	matter you could have because the Watchtower

- 1 relationship was with you, you could have taken the
- 2 Watchtower somewhere else if you wanted to change
- 3 employers?
- 4 A Yes.
- 5 Q You didn't have any sort of non-compete
- 6 agreement I take it with PCUS or with Unisource?
- 7 A No.
- 8 Q Did you ever try to take the Watchtower
- 9 account somewhere else other than PCUS or Unisource?
- 10 A No. Let me qualify the second to last
- 11 question.
- Well, let's let it go at that.
- Q If you at some point in time -- and this
- is sort of getting back to the crux of the lawsuit
- but if you felt like Unisource or Websource --
- 16 Unisource collectively to include Websource and PCUS
- -- was not supporting you properly with the
- 18 Watchtower account, why didn't you just change
- 19 employers and take Watchtower with you?
- A I didn't have any knowledge of what they
- 21 were up to.
- Q Well, at the point in time that you --
- 23 let's say December of 1999, when you had -- I
- believe your testimony was you had met with Wayne

1	Rittenbach, you had met with Fraser representatives
2	and at that point, November-December '99, you knew
3	- well, in fact, you met with Jim O'Toole, by that
4	point you knew you were not going to continue
5	MR. YOUNG: I don't believe that's
6	correct.
7	Q servicing
8	MR. SULLIVAN: Okay, let me finish
9	the question. Let me go back. I sort of lost my
10	train of thought.
11	MR. YOUNG: Sorry.
12	Q As of November-December of 1999 I don't
13	want to go back and ask you questions that we've
14	already been asking but I do want to set a time
15	frame.
16	My recollection is and as testimony,
17	your testimony, will reflect what's already been
18	said but you had met with Watchtower, you met with
19	Fraser and you were aware that you were not going to
20	continue servicing the Watchtower account; is that
21	right?
22	A When are you talking about?
23	Q Let's say December of 1999.
24	A I was aware of what had been said to me.

1	Q But what had been said to you, you were
2	not going to continue servicing the Watchtower
3	account?
4	A Who are we talking about here?
5	Q I'm just asking you generally, your
6	knowledge. I mean I'll put it in front of you, it's
7	already an exhibit but the letter that you wrote to
8	Paul Stewart dated December 3rd of '99.
9	If you turn back to Page 5, as an
10	example, there's a statement towards the top.
11	Jim O'Toole has filled me in on the
12	substance of the December 1 meeting with Watchtower
13	and I believe that the evidence that's already in is
14	that the December 1 meeting with Watchtower was the
15	meeting that O'Toole had with Rittenbach where, you
16	know, it was clear that you were not going to
17	continue to service the Watchtower account.
18	Is that what you're referring to with
19	this statement with Jim O'Toole?
20	A Yes.
21	Q Just using that as a time reference why
22	not at that time, December '99, after December 3,
23	why not move to a different employer and take the
24	Watchtower account with you?

- 1 A Because I had yet to have the opportunity
- 2 to enlist the aide of the management, upper
- 3 management, of the company, which would be the
- 4 normal recourse I would use first.
- 5 Q One of your allegations, and correct me if
- 6 this is wrong, in this lawsuit is that Unisource did
- 7 not provide the support that you were seeking at
- 8 this point in time; correct?
- 9 A They hadn't yet, no.
- 10 Q Did Unisource later provide the support
- 11 you were seeking?
- 12 A No.
- 13 Q At some point in time, in the year 2000,
- 14 why not seek different employment and take the
- 15 Watchtower account with you at that point?
- 16 A It was my view, after a lot of reflection,
- that based on the promises that Jim O'Toole had made
- that he was sincere in his effort to try to rectify
- whatever the circumstances were that had caused the
- 20 fracture with Watchtower and that if we were
- 21 successful together in the long run we would all
- benefit from it.
- Q I don't want to go back over stuff we
- already covered.

1	In the meantime, Watchtower went
2	direct with Fraser?
3	MR. YOUNG: I'm just going to object.
4	I'm not sure, when you say meantime.
5	Q I'm just saying at the point in time in
6	mid-2000, Watchtower went direct with Fraser?
7	A I don't believe that's the case. I don't
8	believe they had at that point.
9	Q We've already got that in the evidence but
10	at the time that you I mean you're alleging that
11	you were discharged but at the time that you left
12	PCUS, actually more properly Unisource at that
13	point, why not at that point seek other employment
14	and take Watchtower with you?
15	A Well because of the damage that they had
16	done to the relationship between PCUS, which I was
17	part of, and the supplier.
18	Q The damage that who had done?
19	A Unisource.
20	Q Are you referring to things you already
21	testified about?
22	A Yes.
23	Q But I thought your testimony was when you
24	met with Mr. Rittenbach, in November of '99, Mr.

- 1 Rittenbach, you know, didn't blame you for anything
- 2 and in fact said that if you could assure him that
- 3 Mr. Romanaux would not continue on the account, that
- 4 he would be able to still work with you?
- 5 A That's correct.
- 6 Q So how -- I mean at that point what
- 7 changed in the year 2000, anything?
- 8 A Well the ongoing circumstance was that we
- 9 had spent many, many years developing Fraser as the
- supplier to the paper corporation and that was still
- a desired route and so that obviously is the line of
- least resistance and if that could have been
- rectified, it would have been in my interest and the
- company's interest and in Watchtower's interest to
- make that whole again.
- 16 Q You're talking about Fraser not ultimately
- 17 going directly with Watchtower?
- 18 A Correct.
- 19 Q I think you just said this but fair to say
- when Unisource ultimately lost Watchtower as a
- 21 client as well, that Unisource suffered damage also;
- 22 Unisource lost a big account?
- 23 A Yes.
- Q This may be an understatement but I assume

1	I'm correct to say that you had a successful career
2	with PCUS?
3	A Yes.
4	Q And you made millions of dollars as a
5	sales representative?
6	A Yes.
7	Q And that income that you made was based
8	primarily on the Watchtower account?
9	A Yes.
10	MR. SULLIVAN: Let me just note for
11	the record that the December 3, 1999, letter that we
12	talked about a few minutes ago was Defendant's
13	Exhibit 7 for the Henwood deposition.
14	Q And Mr. Henwood, I want to go through the
15	amended complaint, the promissory estoppel portions
16	of it, real quickly.
17	I'm pretty sure that we have
18	MR. YOUNG: Just to clarify, for the
19	record, this is the amended complaint dated January
20	21, 2004.
21	MR. SULLIVAN: That's right, because
22	there was an earlier amendment.
23	MR. YOUNG: Off the record.
24	(Discussion held off the record.)

1	Q Mr. Henwood, turn to Page 4, if you will.
2	The first sentence in Paragraph 15 says, in hiring
3	the plaintiff, Mr. Fitzgerald represented to the
4	plaintiff, assured him that the company would do
5	everything in its power to support his relationship
6	with Watchtower.
7	I assume what you're referring to
8	here is the testimony you've already given this
9	morning?
10	A Yes.
11	Q Is there anything else about that that
12	you're alleging Mr. Fitzgerald said other than what
13	you've already testified to?
14	A I think it's important for the record to
15	understand that Watchtower was a unique account and
16	that to the best of my knowledge only a very, very
17	few people had ever successfully done business with
18	them on an extended basis.
19	And the reason for that was the
20	extraordinary amount of service and the intimacy
21	which you needed to know not only the people who
22	purchased the paper or the purchasing department but
23	also the entire manufacturing organization and how
24	it was how they were all entwined and that they

POST REPORTING SERVICE HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

1	were extraordinarily demanding.
2	That any question they have be
3	responded to accurately and most people this is
4	just a judgment on my part most people weren't
5	willing to put the time and effort into it, to do
6	it.
7	And because they purchased a
8	particular basis way of paper, which we went into
9	before, and were in the process of acquiring
10	expensive tailor-made printing presses from Germany
11	bindery equipment that was by far the best I've ever
12	seen, they concerned themselves with every single
13	detail, from the labeling of the paper to how the
14	orders were written.
15	I know some of this is repetitive but
16	since you asked me, I think it's important to
17	emphasize.
18	Each one of those had to be attended
19	to and I made it my business to do so, had made it
20	my business to do so, and it required a lot of
21	pressure and negotiation and effort on my part, on
22	the part of the people that supported me; meaning
23	the inside sales people and management from not only
24	our own company but our supplier.

1	And it was always a question of doing
2	these things to a degree that was sufficiently good
3	to enjoy their continued business.
4	And the reason I'm saying it this way
5	is that there were so many issues of varying
6	importance, on a virtually daily basis, that to try
7	to enumerate them all would take pages and pages of
8	minutia, which I'm sure you're not anxious to have
9	me do.
10	But it was different then doing
11	business with, for instance a Newsweek or Time Inc.
12	where it was primarily a commodity kind of product,
13	printed on commercial equipment, by some printing
14	supplier to them.
15	And this is a case where it's an in-
16	house printing operation, equipment owned by them,
17	people trained that were volunteers and trained by
18	them.
19	So all of those things were very
20	important. In their minds they were not in the
21	commercial world. They were competing, I guess, to
22	a degree with other religions but they wanted a
23	degree of perfection for the sake of the degree of
24	perfection.

- 1 That was just their nature.
- Q Okay. But other than what you've already
- 3 testified about this morning, I just want to be sure
- 4 we're covering all the basis, was there anything
- 5 else that Mr. Fitzgerald said to you in terms of
- 6 your employment that you are now relying upon with,
- 7 you know, your promissory estoppel claim?
- 8 A I've enumerated the things that I can
- 9 recall. There may have been others. I just have to
- 10 say that I -- if they come to mind I'll have to
- mention them but for the moment that's what I can
- 12 recall.
- 13 Q In Paragraph 16 where it says, the
- plaintiff believed and relied on those commitments,
- 15 I assume the phrase those commitments is talking
- about everything you've already talked about this
- 17 morning?
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q This is repetitive but just to clarify
- again, at the time you accepted employment with
- 21 PCUS, you did not have a job offer from any other
- 22 employer?
- 23 A No.
- Q Where it says you relied on those

I	commitments, now did you rely on those commitments?
2	A You'll have to clarify that question.
3	Q Paragraph 16, where it says the plaintiff
4	relied on those commitments I'm just asking how it
5	was that you relied upon them?
6	A My understanding was that if I produced
7	the business, they would follow through with their
8	responsibilities, in terms of paying me my
9	commission rate, supporting all of the requirements
10	for processing and getting it produced by the paper
11	mill, shipped on time, et cetera, et cetera,
12	collecting the money, not interfering with the
13	account obviously, not going behind my back and
14	having private conversations with the customer.
15	Nothing was done, to my knowledge,
16	until the very end. Not a single instance where
17	anyone contacted Watchtower.
18	And this was very that's another
19	promise that no one would contact Watchtower without
20	my prior knowledge.
21	Q Who made that promise?
22	A Fitzgerald.

POST REPORTING SERVICE HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

Q What exactly -- is that what he said?

That's what he said, right, and that

23

24

1	included even the accounting department.
2	If there were debits or a credit that
3	one side or the other didn't understand, that they
4	would contact me before they contacted the customer
5	Not because I would be able to
6	straighten it out but just so that there would be no
7	he said-she said situations, where I wouldn't have
8	first-hand knowledge of even the most relatively
9	minor circumstances.
10	Q I take it that's pretty typical for any
11	sales rep to know what's going on with his or her
12	account?
13	A This particular case it was to a far
14	greater degree then any other account I had ever
15	done business with, far greater.
16	Every single there was no issue
17	too small that gave someone the occasion to go and
18	talk to Watchtower, anyone at Watchtower, ahead of
19	my approval.
20	Q You had to approve somebody talking to
21	Watchtower?
22	A That's right.
23	Q Even if the president of Unisource wanted
24	to talk to them?

- 1 A That was the understanding, yes.
- 2 Q That understanding was, you're saying,
- 3 with Mr. Fitzgerald?
- 4 A It was not only he but as time went on and
- 5 the account began to grow and grow, it was the
- 6 understanding with anybody that would concern
- 7 themselves with the account, right up to the
- 8 president of Unisource.
- 9 Q Did you ever discuss it with the president
- 10 of Unisource?
- 11 A Yes.
- Q Who was that and when did that occur?
- 13 A That was with Ray Mundt and I don't
- 14 remember exactly when the occasion was but it was
- probably one -- I don't remember the exact occasion
- but I remember that we had a comment about it.
- 17 Q What was the conversation?
- 18 A That we, Watchtower and PCUS, had an
- 19 understanding that Ralph Lindem would be the
- spokesman for Watchtower and that I would, in turn,
- 21 be the spokesman for PCUS-Unisource regarding all
- issues, so that -- because there were so many people
- 23 in both companies that potentially could talk to one
- 24 another for one reason or another and this held true

- 1 for Fraser also; that no one was to contact
- 2 Watchtower for any reason unless they had prior okay
- 3 from us.
- 4 Q I assume that changed when Wayne
- 5 Rittenbach became the purchasing manager for
- 6 Watchtower?
- 7 A No, it did not.
- 8 MR. YOUNG: Objection to form.
- 9 Q So you're saying that Wayne Rittenbach
- didn't have authority to contact PCUS?
- MR. YOUNG: I don't think there's
- 12 testimony Wayne Rittenbach became purchasing
- manager. I think that's inaccurate.
- MR. SULLIVAN: The testimony will
- 15 reflect what it reflects.
- 16 Q But are you saying Wayne Rittenbach did
- 17 not have authority to contact you or contact PCUS?
- 18 A Technically speaking, there was no
- 19 conversation with me that modified our prior
- agreement.
- Q Was this some written agreement?
- 22 A No.
- 23 Q You're saying it was an understanding
- 24 between Watchtower and PCUS?

- 1 A Yes.
- 2 Q So you don't know whether Wayne Rittenbach
- 3 had authority to contact PCUS directly?
- 4 A I don't, no.
- 5 Q This conversation with Ray Mundt, was it?
- 6 A Yes.
- 7 Q You say you don't remember when that
- 8 occurred. Would that have been probably early 90's
- 9 sometime?
- 10 A Late 80's.
- 11 Q I assume, I think it's clear from
- 12 Paragraph 16 in your complaint, that you're not
- alleging any violation, for lack of a better term,
- of any alleged promises by PCUS until 1999, 2000?
- 15 A That I'm not alleging what, any promises?
- 16 Q You're not alleging that PCUS or Unisource
- violated any promises until 1999?
- 18 A Not to my knowledge.
- 19 Q If you turn back, Mr. Henwood, to Page 15,
- 20 this is where I want to come back, to be sure we
- 21 talked about all the promises that you're alleging.
- 22 Paragraph 59 refers to -- it says
- promises with regard to, A, support from plaintiff's
- 24 exclusive relationship with the Watchtower as well

as, B, not interfering with the plaintiff's

1

2	relationship with the Watchtower or his Watchtower
3	commissions as alleged above.
4	Is there anything else, any other
5	promises that you're alleging were made to you other
6	than those that we've already talked about, that
7	you're saying Mr. Fitzgerald made to you?
8	A Not that I recall.
9	Q At the bottom of Paragraph 60 you've
10	alleged that you elected to remain employed by
11	defendants instead of pursuing other employment
12	opportunities and taking the Watchtower account with
13	you.
14	Was there and we've already talked
15	about that to an extent but was there any time
16	during your employment with PCUS or Unisource that
17	you sought other employment?
18	A No.

down, alternatively he could, referring to you, he

21 could and would have taken other defensive actions

Q In Paragraph 61 you state, about half-way

22 to avoid the sabotage of his beneficial relationship

with Watchtower.

19

What is that referring to, defensive

- 1 actions?
- 2 A Well I would have pursued other employers
- 3 before I went to PCUS, if we hadn't had these
- 4 understandings.
- 5 Q I think this is referring to in 1999?
- 6 A No, I think this is referring to before I
- 7 started employment.
- 8 MR. YOUNG: Why don't you take a
- 9 minute and just read Paragraph 60 and 61? I think
- 10 Mr. Sullivan's correct.
- 11 Q Yes, I'm not trying to put you on the
- spot, I'm just curious if you can elaborate as to
- what that means.
- 14 A Well, I understand what you're driving at.
- 15 The normal means of -- the normal means of
- defensive action would be to go to the immediate
- superior, which in this particular case was
- 18 Romanaux, and begin the process of meeting with the
- 19 people above him or whoever would be apropos for the
- 20 circumstances at hand.
- Q To take some action with respect to the
- 22 Watchtower account?
- A Well, yes, to take action initially to
- 24 develop a collective strategy on how to proceed.

1	Q The promissory estoppel count has been
2	added to your complaint, I guess to your first
3	amended complaint.
4	Is there any different relief that
5	you're seeking, based on the promissory estoppel
6	claim, then what we've already talked about in your
7	deposition before?
8	MR. YOUNG: Objection, to the extent
9	it calls for a legal conclusion.
10	Q You can answer. I'm just asking, is there
11	anything else that you're claiming? I'm not going
12	to elaborate.
13	You have commission payments that
14	were, well, for the period of time in 2000 that
15	Watchtower was working with Websource and then the
16	payments that were made by Fraser to Websource.
17	We talked about all that stuff, in
18	terms of what you're seeking.
19	Is there anything different from
20	that, that you're seeking, based on your promissory
21	estoppel claim?
22	MR. YOUNG: Can I just clarify, other
23	than what we're claiming with respect to the other
24	accounts?

1	MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.
2	A Well, I'm not an attorney so I'm not able
3	to completely flush out estoppel but if there are
4	additional if there's additional relief that is
5	possible because of this, I would seek that.
6	Q But what you're seeking has been in the
7	complaint?
8	A Yes.
9	Q I think I'm asking you something we
10	already talked about but for some reason I can't
11	remember your answer.
12	In the year 2000, and pardon me for
13	being repetitive, couldn't you have at that point
14	gone to Watchtower and said, look, I'm going to
15	change employers, I want you all to come with me to
16	a different employer?
17	A I don't believe so because I did not know
18	the nature of what had transpired or what actions
19	Unisource had taken. So I had no means of knowing
20	completely and clearly the damage that had been
21	done, other than to know that damage was ongoing.
22	And that's why I wrote the letters to
23	Stewart and so forth, to try to find out what was
24	going on. Would have been operating in the dark at

1	that point.
2	Q I guess what I'm asking is why would any
3	steps we've already gone over what your
4	allegations are, as far as Unisource and Websource
5	with respect to the Watchtower account but why would
6	any actions taken by Unisource impact your ability
7	to go to Watchtower and go to a different employer?
8	A Unisource, Georgia-Pacific could have said
9	no matter what price Henwood comes up with of a
10	subsequent supplier, we'll beat it by a hundred
11	dollars a ton.
12	That would make it impossible.
13	Q But that's speculation on your part,
14	right?
15	A Right, but that's what you asked me to do.
16	Q I'm basing it on your earlier testimony
17	that when you talked to Rittenbach he said, we're
18	not blaming you for this, we'll continue working
19	with you as long as Romanaux is not involved.
20	I'm just wondering why that would not
21	have been the case thereafter?
22	A Because the underlying circumstance was
23	that we had developed Fraser as a good supplier or
24	as a competent supplier and so our efforts were

1	still directed towards that situation and
2	maintaining them as a supplier and until that had
3	been exhausted there wouldn't be any point in going
4	further.
5	Q Any point in going further?
6	A There wouldn't be any point in trying to
7	take the account elsewhere, as long as there was an
8	apparent possibility of maintaining Fraser as a
9	supplier.
10	Q Well I don't mean to beat a dead horse but
11	I guess what I'm asking you is if you felt like in
12	the year 2000 after, for example, your January 25th
13	phone call with Jim O'Toole, that we already had
14	testimony about, if you felt like at that point that
15	Unisource had mishandled the relationship with
16	Watchtower and Fraser, couldn't you have gone to a
17	different employer, taken Watchtower and continued
18	working with Fraser?
19	A Well, first of all, I did not know the
20	extent of the circumstances that existed within
21	Unisource, who was saying what to who and so forth.
22	That's what I was trying to establish
23	and it would have been jumping the gun in my view to

POST REPORTING SERVICE HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

have been that precipitous after 15 years of effort

24

- 1 of developing a supplier without having exhausted
- 2 all of the normal avenues of strategizing and,
- 3 frankly, I thought O'Toole was sincere in his
- 4 efforts initially to try and find out what had
- 5 occurred internally and correct it.
- 6 And so I felt it was prudent to do
- 7 that rather than try and take the account elsewhere.
- 8 It's an enormous task.
- 9 Q Just real quickly, Mr. Henwood, I want to
- 10 ask you about --
- 11 MR. SULLIVAN: Again, I don't think -
- this is Mr. Henwood's affidavit in opposition to
- defendant's motion for summary judgment, so I don't
- think we need to mark this as an exhibit.
- MR. YOUNG: Dated January 8, 2004?
- MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.
- 17 Q Mr. Henwood, if you'll just take a look at
- this, take your time, I'm not going to ask you a
- 19 whole lot about it.
- A All right.
- Q Actually, you can stay right where you are
- for a second on Page 9.
- A Okay.
- Q That's your signature?

- 1 A Yes.
- 2 Q I take it the statements in here are true,
- 3 to the best of your knowledge?
- 4 A Yes.
- 5 Q If you will look at the bottom of Page 2,
- 6 Paragraph 7, the very last line in Paragraph 7 says
- 7 to the contrary he, referring to Robert Fitzgerald?
- 8 A Yes.
- 9 Q Told me that PCUS would compensate me in
- 10 my commission rate for all profit falling to the
- 11 company from revenues generated from my customers.
- 12 And I assume what you're talking
- about there is based on your efforts with the
- 14 customer, correct?
- 15 A Yes.
- 16 Q In Paragraph 9, you state that -- the
- second sentence, several lines long, Mr. Fitzgerald
- also stated I will be provided with all of the
- 19 typical benefits provided to a paper sales
- 20 representative -- and then there's sort of a list of
- 21 items including health insurance, et cetera?
- A Yes.
- Q I take it you received all these things?
- 24 A Yes.

1	MR. SULLIVAN: I don't have any
2	further questions.
3	MR. YOUNG: I think I may have a few
4	follow-ups, if we can go off the record?
5	(Recess)
6	MR. YOUNG: I just have a few follow-
7	up questions.
8	
9	CROSS EXAMINATION
10	BY MR. YOUNG:
11	Q Mr. Henwood, I believe the question Mr.
12	Sullivan asked you was, something along the lines,
13	did your experience at A.T. Clayton make you more
14	suspicious of employers?
15	Do you recall that question?
16	A Yes.
17	Q I believe you answered it no, is that
18	correct?
19	A Yes.
20	Q Were you already suspicious of employers
21	at that time?
22	A Well I was a lot more knowledgeable,
23	having gone through a bit of experience with A.T.
24	Clayton, and then there was the normal course of

- 1 associating with other people in the industry; the
- 2 subject matter came up.
- 3 So I was -- I knew it was a question
- 4 that needed to be asked and so I was -- I don't want
- 5 to say I was weary but I was just informed better.
- 6 Q Mr. Sullivan asked you the question about
- 7 the number of conversations you had with Mr.
- 8 Fitzgerald and I believe you testified it was more
- 9 than one, is that correct?
- 10 A Yes.
- 11 Q Can you give an approximate idea for us of
- 12 how many it was?
- 13 A My best recollection is, between personal
- visits and phones, probably eight or nine.
- 15 Q That was with Mr. Fitzgerald, pre-
- 16 employment?
- 17 A Yes.
- 18 Q I believe you testified with respect to
- 19 your ability to bring the Watchtower account to PCUS
- 20 that one basis for that belief was that the supplier
- 21 was failing, is that correct?
- 22 A Yes.
- Q Other than the fact the supplier was
- 24 failing, was there anything else that led you to

1	believe that the Watchtower account would come with
2	you or made you think the Watchtower account would
3	come with you?
4	A Yes, because I had, as a normal part of my
5	activities as a salesman, made it my business to
6	keep as close tabs on other potential suppliers, not
7	only just the paper mills but paper merchants.
8	That initially got started because
9	the industry was beginning to bring paper in from
10	overseas, so you have to concern yourself not only
11	with domestic but foreign suppliers.
12	And it was important that
13	absolutely had to keep tabs on what the pricing and
14	quality levels were of potential other suppliers in
15	order to maintain your business, whether it was with
16	Watchtower or anybody else.
17	It was really the salesmanship that
18	went along with that.
19	Q In addition to that, did you also have a
20	personal relationship at Watchtower that made you
21	believe they would follow you?
22	A Yes.
23	Q With whom did you have those personal
24	relationships?

- 1 A Primarily with Max Larson, Calvin Schiff,
- 2 Ralph Lindem; those three in particular.
- 3 Q You were asked by Mr. Sullivan if you were
- 4 concerned about other reps at PCUS taking your place
- 5 on the Watchtower if you brought the account with
- 6 you.
- 7 A No.
- 8 Q Why weren't you concerned about that?
- 9 A Mr. Fitzgerald, in our discussions,
- brought up the fact that he had a salesman, Dan
- 11 Romanaux, calling on Watchtower to try to get the
- business that I had at A.T. Clayton, get that
- business away along with other business Watchtower
- had, and that he would take him off that account and
- that no one else would interfere with my activities
- 16 there.
- 17 I had no knowledge that Romanaux was
- calling on Watchtower, so it wasn't anything that I
- brought up. He brought it up.
- Q With respect to that statement by Mr.
- 21 Fitzgerald, before you commenced your employment,
- and all the other statements you testified to today
- and previously, did you rely upon those statements
- in accepting the job with PCUS?

- 1 A Yes.
- 2 Q You were asked a hypothetical question,
- 3 which I know you had some problems with, from Mr.
- 4 Sullivan about if those statements hadn't been made
- 5 would you have taken the job and you were unable to
- 6 answer that question but if forgetting those
- 7 statements being made, if you hadn't been
- 8 comfortable with the level of support and
- 9 exclusivity that had been promised by PCUS, would
- 10 you have taken the job at PCUS?
- 11 MR. SULLIVAN: Objection, calls for
- 12 speculation.
- 13 A No.
- 14 Q Looking at the amended complaint,
- 15 Paragraph 60, this is a duplicate of what I just
- asked you but plaintiff believed and relied on those
- commitments and accepted the arrangement proposed by
- 18 the company.
- Can you tell me how you relied on
- 20 those commitments or promises that Mr. Fitzgerald
- 21 had made to you?
- MR. SULLIVAN: Objection, asked and
- answered.
- Q You can answer.

1	A Just by virtue of accepting the job and
2	beginning the effort to develop sales for the
3	company and seeing is he and the people that worked
4	for him, seeing how they responded, what assistance
5	they gave.
6	Q Then just referring to Paragraph 61, on
7	Page 15, with respect to the last sentence of that
8	paragraph, you were asked a question about you
9	testified in response to a question by Mr. Sullivan
10	with respect to defensive actions you would have
11	taken at PCUS or Unisource.
12	Were there defensive actions you
13	would have taken elsewhere?
14	A Yes.
15	Q What would those have been?
16	A They would have been with Watchtower and
17	with the supplier if it involved a supplier.
18	MR. YOUNG: I don't think I have any
19	other questions.
20	MR. SULLIVAN: Just to follow up on
21	that question.
22	
23	
24	

1	RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION
2	BY MR. SULLIVAN:
3	Q What defensive actions would you have
4	taken with Watchtower?
5	A Well it would depend on the circumstance,
6	what the problem was.
7	The first thing would be to, for
8	instance, well it would depend on what the
9	problem was. I would have met with those at
10	Watchtower that would be pertinent to whatever their
11	circumstances happened to be.
12	Q Are you thinking of a particular problem
13	when you're referring to defensive actions here in
14	your complaint?
15	A A particular one? No, not a particular
16	one.
17	MR. SULLIVAN: Okay, no further
18	questions.
19	MR. YOUNG: Thank you.
20	(Whereupon, the deposition was
21	concluded at 12:26 o'clock P.M.)

#### INDEX OF WITNESS

DAVID D. HENWOOD	PAGE
Direct Examination by Mr. Sullivan	3
Cross Examination by Mr. Young	59
Re-Direct Examination by Mr. Sullivan	65